

### ***Remarks***

Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

### ***Claim Status***

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-2, 5-11, 13-15, 17-28, 31-33, 66, and 69-82 are pending in the application, with claims 1-2, 21, 23, and 66 being the independent claims. Claim 2 has been amended to correct typographical errors. Thus, no new matter is added by way of these amendments, and their entry is respectfully requested.

### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)***

Claims 1-2, 5-11, 13-15, 17-20, 23-28, 31-33, 66, and 69-82 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,939,301. Applicants respectfully traverse.

“When a prior U.S. patent, U.S. patent application publication, or international application publication is not a statutory bar, a 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection can be overcome by... submitting an affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR § 1.132 establishing that the relevant disclosure is applicant's own work.” *In re Mathews*, 408 F.2d 1393, 161 USPQ 276 (CCPA 1969). See MPEP § 2136.05. The MPEP goes on to say:

“[w]hen the unclaimed subject matter of a reference is applicant's own invention, applicant may overcome a *prima facie* case based on the patent ... by showing that the disclosure is a description of applicant's own previous work. Such a showing can be made by proving that the patentee ... was associated with applicant (e.g. worked for the same company) and learned of applicant's invention from applicant”. *Id.*, citing *In re Mathews*, 408 F.2d 1393, 161 USPQ 276 (CCPA 1969).

Applicants filed concurrently herewith a declaration under 37 CFR § 1.132 to show that U.S. Patent 5,939,301 is applicant's own previous work. The cited reference names Deb Chatterjee and John Hughes as inventors. The present application also names Deb Chatterjee as an inventor, in addition to Joseph Solus and Shuwei Yang. Deb Chatterjee has averred in his declaration submitted herewith that he “conceived or invented mutant *The* DNA polymerases having reduced 3’

to 5' exonuclease activity, 5' to 3' exonuclease activity and mutations in the O-helix domain, including mutant polymerases having a Tyr for Phe substitution at amino acid position 67 disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 5,939,301." Because Deb Chatterjee is an inventor of the work described in both the present application and the cited patent, the requirements of MPEP § 2136.05 and *In re Matthews* have been satisfied. The work disclosed in the cited patent reference is applicant's own work, and the present claims therefore cannot be anticipated by this patent reference. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 USC § 102(e) be withdrawn.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Bernadette M. Perfect/

Reg. No. 53,267

Bernadette M. Perfect

Patent Agent

Date: October 1, 2007

Invitrogen Corporation  
1600 Faraday Avenue  
Carlsbad, CA 92008  
(760) 476-7120